United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/29/MNE/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
31 October 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-ninth session
15-26 January 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Montenegro*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 8 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[2]

2. The Council of Europe (CoE) noted that in 2013 Montenegro ratified the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention).[3]

3. In 2014, the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (CoE-Commissioner) welcomed Montenegro's ratification of the UN Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness in 2013.[4]

B. National human rights framework[5]

4. The Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms of Montenegro (Ombudsman) reported that the 2014 amendments to the Law on the Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms of Montenegro strengthened its autonomy and independence and reinforced its mandate as the National Mechanism for the Prevention of Torture (NPM) and the Institutional Mechanism for the Protection against Discrimination. However, it noted that the proposal concerning the possibility for the Ombudsman to act as "amicus curiae" had

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

not been accepted and that sufficient funds had not been allocated to promotional activities.[6]

5. The Ombudsman indicated that the NPM activities were carried out in a separate workspace, that the NPM Working Group included external experts from different fields and that the NMP's four-year and annual visit plans had been adopted in consultation with NGOs. It also noted a significant increase in the number of complaints from persons deprived of their liberty as a result of the NMP's activities.[7] Amnesty International (AI) stated that NPM's recommendations were often ignored by the authorities and that concerns remained about its independence.[8] In 2014, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CoE-CPT) recommended that Montenegro consider creating a specific budget head for the NPM's activities within the overall budget of the Ombudsman's Office.[9]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[10]

6. The Ombudsman stated that Montenegro's legislative framework was largely in compliance with anti-discrimination standards contained in international treaties ratified by Montenegro and EU directives.[11] CoE-Commissioner noted that the 2014 Law on Amendments of the Law on Prohibition of Discrimination introduced a new concept of direct and indirect discrimination and a definition of hate speech in line with European standards. He also observed that a legislative amendment of the Criminal Code of Montenegro in 2013 provided that the courts would consider it an aggravating circumstance if a criminal offence was committed out of hatred on the grounds of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity.[12] The Ombudsman considered crucial to similarly amend misdemeanour provisions and to remove existing deficiencies in relation to the detection and prosecution of hate speech and hate crimes.[13]

7. While recognising a number of legislative improvements, AI noted a number of measures that threatened Montenegro's already weak anti-discrimination architecture, such as the abolishment of the Anti-Discrimination Council, the dismissal of the Prime Minister's human rights adviser, and a reported decline in support for measures to guarantee LGBTI rights.[14]

8. In 2014, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) was pleased to note that anti-discrimination training had been provided in a large number of sectors, including members of the Ombudsman's office, human rights NGOs, inspection service personnel and representatives of local governments.[15] CoE-Commissioner was concerned by the lack of adequate expertise in the Ombudsman's Office to efficiently handle complaints relating to discrimination.[16]

9. In 2015, the Committee of Ministers under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-CM) noted that negative stereotypes and prejudices against persons belonging to the Roma minority, in particular the internally displaced persons from Kosovo[1], continued to persist. It recommended that Montenegro expand the measures aimed at promoting tolerance and inter-ethnic dialogue throughout the country.[17] CoE-Commissioner stated that various reports indicate that the Roma remained the most vulnerable and marginalised minority in Montenegro.[18]

10. The Ombudsman reported that the LGBTIQ population was still exposed to the risk of various forms of violation of their rights, including violence.[19] CoE noted that the CoE-Commissioner, while commending Montenegro for its measures to improve human rights

[1] All references to Kosovo in the present document should be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).

of LGBTI persons, urged the authorities to continue their efforts to combat homophobia and transphobia, including through systematic awareness-raising and educational activities, and called on them to effectively investigate all reported cases of violence against LGBTI persons.[20]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

11. The Ombudsman stated that Montenegro had improved its normative and institutional framework in the field of environmental protection and that violations of the right to a healthy environment were mainly due to the inconsistent implementation of the regulations in the field of urban planning, construction, waste disposal, and air and acoustic pollution. It noted that environmental awareness of the citizenry was still low.[21]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person

12. AI recommended that Montenegro amend the Criminal Code to define torture in compliance with the Convention against Torture, ensure penalties commensurate with the gravity of the crime and remove the statute of limitations on torture. It also recommended that Montenegro separately define enforced disappearance in the Criminal Code and recognize it as a continuing offence.[22]

13. In 2014, the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-ACFC) recommended that Montenegro continue and extend the measures to raise awareness among members of the police force regarding respect for diversity and human and minority rights. It also recommended that authorities strengthen supervisory mechanisms to monitor police behaviour.[23]

14. AI reported that torture and other ill-treatment of detainees in police stations and prisons continued in Montenegro and that the authorities rarely conducted prompt and impartial investigations. It noted that impunity was also enjoyed in the context of public order policing, especially by Montenegro's Special Anti-Terrorist Unit, as suggested by the slow investigation and lack of disciplinary measures or prosecutions for the events of October 2015, when riot police used excessive force to remove a camp of demonstrators outside the Parliament.[24]

15. CoE-CPT noted that during its 2013 visit to Montenegro it received many allegations of physical ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty by the police. It observed that the great majority of them referred to ill-treatment inflicted at the time of questioning, and that the ill-treatment was in some cases of such severity that it could be considered to amount to torture. It considered necessary that Montenegro apply a multi-faced approach in order to change the culture within the police that viewed ill-treatment as acceptable and ensure that any such allegation was investigated promptly and thoroughly. It called on the Montenegrin authorities at the highest level to periodically deliver a clear message that all forms of ill treatment of detained persons were illegal and would be punished accordingly and to adopt whistle blower protection measures.[25]

16. CoE-CPT recommended ensuring that all newly-arrived prisoners received a thorough medical examination and that the medical report was systematically brought to the attention of the competent prosecutor whenever injuries indicative of ill-treatment were recorded.[26] It also recommended expressly guaranteeing to persons deprived of their liberty by the police the right of access to a doctor from the very outset of their deprivation of liberty.[27]

17. CoE-CPT noted Montenegro's renovation efforts of some prisons' infrastructure. However, it observed overcrowding in some detention centres and recommended that Montenegro pursue its efforts to combat it.[28]

18. CoE-CPT noted that, although most inmates interviewed stated that they had been treated correctly by penitentiary staff, it had received some allegations of ill-treatment of inmates by staff and episodes of inter-prisoner violence. It recommended that a firm message be delivered to prison staff that physical ill-treatment and verbal abuse of prisoners

were not acceptable and would be punished accordingly and that authorities invest more efforts in tackling and eradicating inter-prisoner violence.[9]

19. Regarding the deinstitutionalisation of persons with intellectual disabilities in the Komanski Most Institution, CoE-Commissioner called on Montenegro to develop community and alternative care solutions and to initiate a process for the carefully planned and gradual closure of the institution.[10]

20. CoE reported that the CoE-Commissioner called on the authorities to effectively investigate all reported cases of violence against LGBTI persons and ensure accountability before the law.[11]

Administration of justice, including impunity and the rule of law[12]

21. In 2015, the Group of States against Corruption (CoE-GRECO) stated that, despite positive legislative changes, corruption continued to be an important concern in Montenegro.[13] It noted the measures taken, such as the adoption of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption and the establishment of an Agency for the Prevention of Corruption and of a Special Prosecution Office for the Fight Against Corruption and Organized Crime. However, it observed that, while the legislative and policy framework could be considered strong on paper, its practical effectiveness continued to be put into question, in particular in relation to high level corruption cases.[14]

22. The Ombudsman noted that, despite an increased efficiency of courts and a reduced number of backlog cases, the long duration of judicial proceedings persisted. It considered necessary to strengthen the judiciary and improve its accountability system.[15]

23. CoE-GRECO noted the Constitutional changes adopted in 2013 to reduce political influence on the appointment of high level judicial officials through more transparent and merit based procedures. It recommended that Montenegro take additional measures to strengthen the independence of the Judicial Council, which had the responsibility of appointing, promoting, transferring and dismissing judges.[16] CoE-GRECO also recommended that Montenegro further develop the disciplinary framework for judges and prosecutors and publish information on complaints received, disciplinary action taken and sanctions applied against judges and prosecutors.[17]

24. CoE-ACFC noted that the right to use minority languages in court was respected in practice and that in municipalities with a high presence of minority population the judges also included minority language speakers.[18]

25. AI stated that impunity persisted for war crimes against Montenegro's civilian population. It referred to several war crime cases that ended with the acquittal of the defendants and welcomed that seven of these cases were reportedly under review to determine if sufficient ground existed to reopen the proceedings. It recommended that Montenegro ensure that all prosecutions of crimes under international law were conducted promptly and impartially and in accordance with international fair trial standards, as also recommended by recommendations 118.11[19] and 119.13[20] of the previous UPR.[21] CoE noted that the CoE-Commissioner recommended developing programmes for systematic professional training in international criminal and humanitarian law targeting prosecutors and judges.[22]

26. AI noted that victims of crimes under international law had rarely received reparations and recommended that Montenegro introduce legislation to provide an effective administrative framework for reparations for civilian victims of war, including the relatives of the missing, as recommended in recommendation 117.62[23] of the previous UPR.[24] CoE noted that the CoE-Commissioner urged Montenegro to develop, in close consultation with victims, reparation initiatives that go beyond compensation and include victim's rehabilitation and social inclusion if necessary.[25]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[26]

27. CoE-ACFC noted that, the electoral legislation had been amended to create more favourable conditions for the election of deputies from national minorities. However, it observed that the introduction of a particular rule for the Croatian minority, lowering the

threshold of the votes needed in order to obtain a seat in the Parliament, had created an unjustified distinction in treatment between candidates of the Croatian and Roma minorities, whose number was very similar according to the 2011 census.[48]

28. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE/ODIHR) reported that the 2016 parliamentary elections were held in a competitive environment and fundamental freedoms were generally respected. It noted that the Election Observation Mission recommended, inter alia, that Montenegro reform, through an inclusive process, the election legislation, reviewing the residency and legal capacity requirements for voting and introducing internal measures for political parties to promote women to senior positions. It also recommended reviewing the election appeals system to guarantee an effective and timely remedy for all complaints.[49]

29. CoE-MIE noted that Montenegro had established Minority Councils representing the Albanian, Bosniak, Croat, Muslim, Roma and Serb national minorities, which played an active role in stimulating public debate on issues affecting national minorities. However, it observed that, although they were established under the Law on Minority Rights and had a role in the legislative process, they were essentially considered to be non-governmental organisations without any real decision-making power. It also noted that there was no mechanism to guarantee a gender balance in their composition and that they were subject to criticism due to the perception of being vehicles of political patronage.[50] The Ombudsman considered essential to strengthen the role of such councils, in particular their consultative and advisory functions, and to encourage additional financial support for the realization of their projects and other activities.[51]

30. AI reported that journalists and media workers continued to receive threats, that some of them had been physically assaulted, including by police officers, and that independent media offices had been damaged. It noted that impunity persisted for both past violations and more recent attacks. Since the last UPR, some 20-25 cases of attacks against journalists and media outlets had been documented annually but, with few exceptions, these crimes remained unresolved. AI also noted that journalists critical of the government, along with NGOs and human rights defenders, continued to be subjected to smear campaigns by media supportive of the government.[52] It recommended that Montenegro take effective action to end impunity for past attacks on independent media and journalists and ensure that all reported threats and attacks against journalists, media workers, NGOs and human rights defenders were investigated promptly, thoroughly, impartially and independently.[53]

31. AI reported that, in November 2013, the Ministry of Interior established a Commission for Monitoring Actions of Competent Authorities in the Investigation of Cases of Threats and Violence against Journalists, Assassinations of Journalists and Attacks on Media Property. It noted however that the Commission had been denied access to relevant classified documents, that five non-state members of the Commission were still denied security clearance, and that the Commission had not met since 2016.[54]

32. CoE-Commissioner noted that, although defamation was now dealt with by civil courts, it was important to ensure that judgements fully complied with the requirements of article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and recalled that awards by courts of disproportionate amounts as damages may contravene it.[55]

33. CoE-Commissioner found unacceptable the public use by certain leading politician of inflammatory remarks, including personal insults, against journalists and their work. He also noted reports indicating that media content was significantly influenced by the business and political interests of media owners, and that media ownership was not transparent.[56]

34. Alliance Defending Freedom International (ADF International) noted that the law required religious groups to register with the police within 15 days of their establishment in order to be recognized as a legal entity. It further observed that most religious groups objected to the Draft Law on Freedom of Religion in Montenegro proposed by the Government in 2019, which would allow only Montenegrin citizens to establish religious groups and teach religious classes; require religious groups to "confidentially inform" the government prior to the appointment of church officials; and make all churches and monasteries built before 1918 into State property.[57] ADF International recommended that

Montenegro ensure that any system of registration of religious communities did not discriminate against any individual or group and that the authorities refrain from intervening in the internal workings of church governance and from siding with or unfairly benefiting any religious faction.[58]

35. CoE-ACFC noted that no significant progress had been achieved regarding the restitution of religious property confiscated under the former communist regime and invited the authorities to proceed with such restitution.[59]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[60]

36. In 2016, the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CoE-GRETA) noted the adoption of a National Strategy for combating human trafficking for the period 2012-2018, implemented through annual or biannual actions plans. However, it noted that there was no external evaluation or monitoring of the implementation of the strategy or the plans and recommended that Montenegro examine the possibility of designating an independent mechanism to monitor the anti-trafficking activities of State institutions.[61]

37. In 2016, the Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CoE-CP) welcomed a number of progresses in Montenegro's action to combat human trafficking.[62] It recommended that Montenegro take additional steps to ensure that all victims of trafficking benefitted from assistance and protection measures; facilitate access to compensation for victims; guarantee the application of the non-punishment provision; and ensure that human trafficking cases, including those involving public officials, were investigated, prosecuted and led to effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions.[63]

Right to privacy and family life[64]

38. The Ombudsman observed that the Law on Registered Partnership, which had been submitted to the Parliament in 2012, had not yet been adopted.[65]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[66]

39. The Ombudsman reported that employments opportunities had not significantly improved and that the situation of unemployed vulnerable groups and individuals, such as the elderly, persons with disabilities, Roma and displaced persons, was particularly difficult. It considered crucial to intensify activities to reduce unemployment, increase the minimum wage, and ensure that private companies comply with labour legislation.[67]

40. CoE-Commissioner commended the efforts undertaken so far by the authorities, but noted that Roma continued to face serious difficulties in the field of employment.[68]

41. In 2016, European Committee of Social Rights (CoE-ESC) reported that in Montenegro nationals of other State Parties did not have access to certain jobs, which constituted discrimination on grounds of nationality, and that the legislation prohibited women from performing certain occupations, which constituted a discrimination based on sex.[69]

42. The European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) reported on the discriminatory treatment affecting the civilian personnel and the military personnel under temporary contract of the Montenegrin armed forces on different issues, in particular in relation to housing rights, working conditions, benefits and compensations for health and safety hazards, length of contract and reintegration into civil life.[70]

Right to social security

43. CoE-ESC reported that in Montenegro the duration of the unemployment benefit was too short and the minimum level of old-age pension was inadequate.[71]

Right to an adequate standard of living[71]

44. CoE-ESC noted that in Montenegro the level of social assistance was manifestly inadequate and family benefits did not cover a significant number of families.[72]

45. AI noted that recommendations on the right of adequate housing of refugees from Kosovo, who had lived at the Konig camps outside Podgorica since 1999, had been only partially implemented and that some 977 persons remained at Konig I almost 18 years after they flew from Kosovo.[73] CoE-ECRI welcomed the efforts of the authorities, through the Regional Housing Programme, to solve the problem of Konik and close it down. However, it remained concerned that the housing solution proposed was the construction of standard accommodation in the area of existing camps, which was a suburb of Podgorica and isolated from the majority of the population. Moreover, CoE-ECRI was unaware of any participation of the Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian community in the decision-making process on this important issue affecting them.[74]

Right to health[75]

46. CoE-Commissioner observed that in 2012 the government adopted a new Strategy for Improving the Position of the Roma and Egyptians in Montenegro 2012-2016 and an accompanying action plan, which inter alia envisaged measures aimed at raising awareness among Roma about their right to health. He noted the activities conducted by the Ministry of Health in this regard, including raising awareness initiatives, the existence of health mediators that interacted with Roma and provided them with the necessary assistance, and the preparation of a strategy on reproductive care, which paid special attention to Roma women. CoE-Commissioner hoped that this strategy would help address concerns relating to the poor state of reproductive health of Roma women, especially in the Konik camps.[76]

Right to education[77]

47. The Ombudsman noted that, regardless of the measures taken, the problem of low coverage in preschool education was still present and that the current network of preschool institutions did not provide accessible and quality preschool education to all children. It also noted that inclusion of children with special educational needs into the regular educational system had improved, but that inter-sectorial cooperation needed to be strengthened.[78]

48. CoE-ACFC observed that teaching in minority languages was organised at the primary and secondary level in the municipalities inhabited by persons belonging to the Albanian minority and that new curricula had been adopted in the field of language and literature which included elements of Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian language and literature. It recommended that Montenegro ensure that good quality textbooks and manuals were available for all subjects taught in minority languages at all levels of education and encourage schools to consistently use the possibility offered in the general curriculum of reflecting the identity and culture of persons belonging to national minorities.[79]

49. CoE-ACFC noted that, although the number of Roma children attending primary schools had increased, there was still an urgent need for sustained efforts to increase their attendance past the primary level. It welcomed Montenegro's efforts in this regard and recommended that the Roma Minority Council should be involved at all stages in education programmes, including their design, monitoring and evaluation.[80]

50. In relations to the establishment of a bus service to transport the Roma children from the Konik camps to various schools around Podgorica, CoE-Commissioner considered that it would be advisable to first provide the families of the children concerned with adequate housing and then ensure that Roma children attend mainstream schools where they could mix with children from other communities.[81]

51. The Ombudsman indicated that it was necessary to strengthen psychological and pedagogical services within schools to provide adequate support to children, parents and teachers in addressing the issue of increasing peer violence.[82]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[84]

52. The Ombudsman reported that, despite improved legislation and the strategic documents adopted, gender inequality was still evident and reflected by the lack of political and social participation of women, the economic inequality between men and women, the unequal sharing of responsibilities within families, and the differences in access to property rights.[85]

53. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) noted that domestic violence was a pervasive problem in Montenegro. It observed that Montenegro had taken critical steps toward protecting victims and holding offenders accountable, including the adoption of the Law on Domestic Violence Protection and of a Protocol on Actions, Prevention and Protection Against Family Violence, but stressed that additional efforts were needed.[86]

54. JS1 observed that key actors in the fight against domestic violence, including the police, judges, prosecutors, health care professionals and staff at the Center for Social Welfare, frequently lacked adequate knowledge of the Law on Domestic Violence Protection, did not understand the dynamics of domestic violence, were often insensitive to victims, and failed to hold offenders accountable. JS1 recommended that Montenegro implement regular and comprehensive training for all system actors and prioritize victims' safety by, inter alia, systematically informing all victims of the availability of protection measures and of their rights to a supportive advocate, prohibiting the use of "confrontation" by judges in domestic violence cases, and adequately funding NGO services for victims.[87] JS1 also noted that criminal law, misdemeanour law and family legislation provisions related to domestic violence needed to be harmonised with the Law on Domestic Violence Protection.[88]

55. The Ombudsman considered essential to intensify and improve the work of multidisciplinary teams as well as the monitoring of the implementation of protective measures, security measures and suspended sentences, which were mostly imposed to the offenders of domestic violence.[89]

Children[90]

56. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) welcomed the enactment of amendments to the Family Law which prohibited "corporal punishment or any other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment" and extended this to parents, guardians and all other persons taking care of or coming into contact with the child. However, since the law did not contain a definition of the term "corporal punishment", GIEACPC recommended that Montenegro enact and implement a legal ban of all corporal punishment of children, however light, in every setting of their lives, as a matter of priority.[91]

Persons with disabilities[92]

57. The Ombudsman noted that the situation of persons with disabilities needed to be enhanced by providing a physically accessible environment, overcoming communication barriers and strengthening support services and assistive technologies. It stressed the need to apply the concept of supported decision-making and promote the independent living of persons with disabilities, by removing all barriers that may hinder their full and effective participation in the society on an equal basis with others.[93]

58. CoE-Commissioner commended the strengthening of the domestic legislative and institutional framework regarding the human rights of persons with disabilities and called upon the authorities to step up their efforts aimed at the implementation of the legislation relating to spatial planning. He also noted concerns about some shortcomings in the legislation, such as the lack of penalties for the violation of the employers' obligation to provide "reasonable accommodation".[94]

Minorities[95]

59. CoE-ACFC observed that a climate of tolerance and understanding between persons belonging to national minorities and the majority continued to prevail in Montenegro, including in municipalities with ethnically mixed population.[96] It welcomed the fact that legislative provisions guaranteeing the rights of persons belonging to national minorities contained in the Law on Minority Rights and the 2007 Constitution had been expanded and strengthened by a number of legislative acts in the field of data protection, culture, education, elections, civil registration and identity documents, but noted that there were significant problems with implementation of such laws.[97]

60. CoE-ACFC noted that Montenegro had not amended the definition of the term "national minority" contained in the Law on Minority Rights to ensure that it was harmonised with the Constitution. In particular, whereas the Law on Minority Rights established a direct link between citizenship and national minorities, the Constitution of 2007 made no such explicit link.[98]

61. The Ombudsman noted the need to further improve the situation of national minority groups by ensuring proportional representation within public sector at the state and local level and monitoring the implementation of the measures adopted.[99]

62. Despite the efforts made by the authorities to improve the situation of Roma in a range of areas, in particular in the framework of the 2012-2016 Strategy to improve the Position of Roma and Egyptians in Montenegro, CoE-ACFC noted that a large number of Roma did not participate in the economic life of the country.[100] It noted persistent negative stereotypes and prejudice against persons belonging to the Roma minority and invited the authorities to promote intercultural dialogue, mutual understanding and respect, as well as to combat prejudice towards persons belonging to national minorities and IDPs living in Montenegro, particularly through education and the media.[101]

63. CoE-ACFC encouraged Montenegro to continue supporting radio and television broadcasting in the languages of national minorities, provide radio and television coverage to issues affecting national minorities, and ensure that public TV and radio stations mainstream the interests of minorities into their regular programming.[102]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[103]

64. CoE noted that the CoE-Commissioner encouraged the authorities to step up their efforts to ensure that displaced persons who wish to do so had their legal status in Montenegro regularised.[104]

65. CoE-CM recommended that Montenegro continue to assist internally displaced persons with the acquisition of identity documents; find, in consultation with those concerned, durable solutions which would enable the closure of the Konik Camp; and provide for adequate integration or return opportunities for the camp's inhabitants, including by allocation of necessary resources.[105]

Stateless persons[106]

66. AI noted that, despite ratifying the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness in 2013, Montenegro had no procedure to determine statelessness and stated that at least 800 Roma and Egyptians remained at risk of statelessness. It recommended that Montenegro take prompt measures to introduce into the law a robust process to determine statelessness in order to ensure that all Kosovo Roma and Egyptians were entitled to full enjoyment of their rights.[107]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.
Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom International (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
EUROMIL	European Organisation of Military Associations (Belgium);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: The Advocates for Human Rights (United States of America); SOS Hotline for Women and Children Victims of Violence-Niksic (Montenegro); Women's Rights Center (Montenegro).

National human rights institution:

Ombudsman	Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms of Montenegro (Montenegro).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France); **Attachments:** (CoE-CPT) Report to the Government of Montenegro on the visit to Montenegro carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 13 to 20 February, 2013, CPT/Inf(2014)16; (CoE-Commissioner) Report by Mr. Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, following his visit to Montenegro from 17 to 20 March 2014, Strasbourg, CommDH (2014) 13; (CoE-ECRI) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance Conclusions on the Implementation of the Recommendations in Respect of Montenegro Subject to Interim Follow-Up, adopted on 9 December 2014, CRI(2015)7; (CoE-ACFC) – Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Second Opinion on Montenegro, adopted on 19 June 2013, Strasbourg, ACFC/OP/II(2013)002; (CoE-CM) – Committee of Ministers under the terms of Articles 24 to 26 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Resolution on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Resolution by Montenegro, CM/ResCMN(2015)2; (CoE-GRETA) – Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Montenegro, adopted on 8 July 2016, GRETA(2016)19; (CoE-CP) – Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Recommendation on the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human beings by Montenegro, adopted on 4 November 2016, CP(2016)10; (CoE-GRECO) – Group of States against Corruption, Fourth Evaluation Round, Evaluation Report Montenegro, adopted on 19 June 2015, Greco Eval IV Rep (2014) 6E; (CoE-ESC) Factsheet on Montenegro of the Department of the European Social Charter, Directorate General of Human Rights and the Rule of Law;
OSCE/ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

[1] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.43, 118.1 and 119.1-119.8.

[3] See CoE, p. 5.
[4] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 12.
[5] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.1-117.7, 117.9.
[6] See Ombudsman, p. 1.
[7] See Ombudsman, p.3. See also CoE-CPT, para. 9.
[8] See AI, p. 2.
[9] See CoE-CPT, para. 10.
[10] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.19-117.27, 117.33-117.35 and 118.8.
[11] See Ombudsman, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner, p. 15; CoE-ACFC, p. 6; and CoE-CM, p. 1.
[12] See CoE-Commissioner, p.15.
[13] See Ombudsman, p. 3.
[14] See AI, pp. 2-3.
[15] See CoE-ECRI, p. 6.
[16] See CoE-Commissioner, p.3 and 21.
[17] See CoE-CM, pp. 3 and 4.
[18] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 16.
[19] See Ombudsman, p. 5.
[20] See CoE, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner, pp. 4 and 18.
[21] See Ombudsman, p. 2.
[22] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.8, 117.36 and 119.12.
[23] See AI, pp. 2 and 9.
[24] See CoE-ACFC, p. 22.
[25] See AI, pp. 7-8.
[26] See CoE-CPT, paras. 14, and 16-18.
[27] See CoE-CPT, para. 25.
[28] See CoE-CPT, para. 30.
[29] See CoE-CPT, paras. 38, 40.
[30] See CoE-CPT, paras. 41-43.
[31] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 4. See also CoE, p. 2.
[32] See CoE, p. 3.
[33] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.52-117.62, 118.11 and 119.13.
[34] See CoE-GRECO, p. 3.
[35] See CoE-GRECO, p. 7.
[36] See Ombudsman, p. 2.
[37] See CoE-GRECO, pp. 3-4, 22-24 and 38.
[38] See CoE-GRECO, pp.29-30, 36 and 38-39.
[39] See CoE-ACFC, p. 26.
[40] See A/HRC/23/12, para. 118.11 (Spain).
[41] See A/HRC/23/12, para. 119.13 (Switzerland).
[42] See AI, pp. 3-4 and 9. See also CoE-Commissioner, pp.7-9.
[43] See CoE, p. 2.
[44] See A/HRC/23/12, para. 117.62 (France).
[45] See AI, pp. 5 and 9. See also CoE, p. 2.
[46] See CoE, p. 2.
[47] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.37, 117.63-117.71, 118.12-118.13 and 119.14-119.15.
[48] See CoE-ACFC, pp.8-9. See also CoE-CM, pp. 3 and 4.
[49] See OSCE/ODIHR, p. 2.
[50] See CoE-ACFC, p. 5 and 9. See also CoE-CM, p. 4.
[51] See Ombudsman, p. 4.
[52] See AI, pp. 5-6.
[53] See AI, p. 9. See also CoE, p. 3.
[54] See AI, p. 6.
[55] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 23.
[56] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 25.
[57] See ADF International, paras. 7-14.
[58] See ADF International, para. 16.
[59] See CoE-ACFC, p. 23.
[60] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.46-117.51 and 118.1.
[61] See CoE-GRETA, paras. 23-26.
[62] See CoE-CP, pp. 1-2.
[63] See CoE-CP, p. 1-3. See also CoE-GRETA, paras. 88-131, 144-160.

[64] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, para. 118.7.
[65] See Ombudsman, p. 5.
[66] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.29 and 118.6.
[67] See Ombudsman, p. 2.
[68] See CoE-Commissioner, pp. 17 and 21. See also ODIHR/OSCE, p. 8.
[69] See CoE-ESC, pp. 3 and 4.
[70] See EUROMIL, pp. 1-2.
[71] See CoE-ESC, p. 4.
[72] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.10-117.11.
[73] See CoE-ESC, p. 4.
[74] See AI, p. 1. See also ODIHR/OSCE, p. 7.
[75] See CoE-ECRI, pp. 6-7.
[76] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, para.118.3.
[77] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 16.
[78] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.77, 117.87 and 118.3-118.4.
[79] See Ombudsman, p. 3.
[80] See CoE-ACFC, pp. 8 and 28-29, 32. See also CoE-CM, p. 2 and 3-4.
[81] See CoE-ACFC, p. 8, 29-31. See also CoE-CM, p. 3-4, and ODIHR/OSCE, p. 8.
[82] See CoE-Commissioner, p. 18.
[83] See Ombudsman, p. 3.
[84] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.28-117.31, 117.38-117.42, 117.44-117.45 and 118.6-118.7.
[85] See Ombudsman, p. 4.
[86] See JS1, p. 2.
[87] See JS1, pp. 2, 4-9 and 10-11.
[88] See JS1, p.4.
[89] See Ombudsman, p. 4. See also JS1, pp. 7-8.
[90] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.12-117.18, 117.32, 118.2-118.5, 118.10 and 119.5-119.11.
[91] See GII-ACPC, p. 1 and 3. See also OSCE/ODIHR, p. 5.
[92] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.24 and 117.72-117.77.
[93] See Ombudsman, p. 4.
[94] See CoE-Commissioner, pp. 4, 19 and 21. See also OSCE/ODIHR, p. 3.
[95] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.24-117.25 and 117.78-117.88.
[96] See CoE-ACFC, pp. 7 and 20.
[97] See CoE-ACFC, p. 6.
[98] See CoE-ACFC, p. 6 and 11. See also CoE-CM, p.1.
[99] See Ombudsman, p. 4.
[100] See CoE-ACFC, p. 9. See also CoE-Commissioner, p. 4.
[101] See CoE-ACFC, p. 7, 21.
[102] See CoE-ACFC, pp. 1, 7 and 25. See also CoE-CM, p. 2.
[103] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras. 117.24-117.25, 117.27 and 117.89-117.96.
[104] See CoE, p. 2.
[105] See CoE-CM, p. 4.
[106] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/23/12, paras.119.5-119.6.
[107] See AI, pp. 1-2, 9. See also CoE, p. 2.